UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,957	09/27/2000	Inching Chen	ITL.1780US (P9234)	8316

21906 7590 09/28/2007

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER	
CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2621	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
09/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/671,957	CHEN, INCHING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dave Czekaj	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-9,13 and 33-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *4-9,13 and 33-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 5/11/07, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Mehrdad Dastouri
MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim does not meet the 35 U.S.C. 101 requirements (the claims have improper language regarding the machine-readable medium). Please see the USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" in the Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005. In particular a machine-readable medium encoded with (stored thereon, embedded with or embodying) a computer program", should be recited in the claim in order to be considered statutory. Linking words such as including, comprising, listing and having, are not acceptable as a substitute term for "encoded with".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 4-6 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyanagi et al. (5557332), (hereinafter referred to as "Koyanagi") in view of Wee et al. (6553150), (hereinafter referred to as "Wee").

Regarding claims 4 and 33, Koyanagi discloses an apparatus for parallel decoding prediction-coded video signals (Koyanagi: column 1, lines 10-12). This apparatus comprises "decoding a picture into a plurality of slices having a set of slices at least partially within an area of the picture" (Koyanagi: column 6, lines 34-45, wherein the set of slices are the set of three slices which are decoded (the second, sixth, and tenth slice)), "decoding the set of slices into a plurality of

macroblocks" (Koyanagi: figure 2), and "decoding the macroblocks into pixels" (Koyanagi: column 10, lines 50-55). However, this apparatus lacks not decoding the plurality of slices as claimed. Wee teaches that prior art computing systems must entirely decompressed/decoded a video signal even if only a small part of the signal is being edited (Wee: column 2, lines 4-10). To help alleviate this problem, Wee discloses only decoding a set of slices (Wee: column 24, lines 39-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Koyanagi and add the decoding taught by Wee in order to obtain an apparatus that operates more efficiently by only decoding the necessary slices of the image thus reducing the computation time on the processor.

Regarding claims 5 and 34, Wee discloses "the area is a region of interest" (Wee: column 10, lines 45-59, wherein the region of interest is the object).

Regarding claims 6 and 35, Koyanagi discloses "displaying the decoded set of macroblocks" (Koyanagi: figure 15, item 124).

4. Claims 7-9, 13, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (6496607), (hereinafter referred to as "Krishnamurthy") in view of Li et al. (6807550), (hereinafter referred to as "Li").

Regarding claims 7 and 36, Krishnamurthy discloses an apparatus that identifies and uses regions of interest to provide functionalities (Krishnamurthy:

column 1, lines 8-12). This apparatus comprises "creating and transmitting a substream from a stream, the substream corresponding to a region of interest" (Krishnamurthy: figure 1, column 4, lines 32-67 - column 5, lines 1-17, wherein the stream is the input sequence). However, this apparatus lacks creating and sending the second substream to a second recipient. Li teaches that prior art image processing systems have fallen short for providing a desirable user experience (Li: column 2, lines 33-37). To help alleviate this problem, Li discloses "creating a second MPEG substream that is different than the first ROI" (Li: column 12, lines 30-51) and "transmitting the substream to a second recipient" (Li: figure 2, wherein multiple clients are shown receiving the substreams). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system taught by Li in order to obtain an apparatus that becomes more versatile by being able to transmit data to a plurality of different users and provide the users with a desirable experience.

Regarding claims 8 and 37, Krishnamurthy discloses "synchronizing display of the substream with a second substream" (Krishnamurthy: figures 1 and 4, column 6, lines 39-44, wherein the buffers synchronize many streams).

Regarding claims 9 and 38, Krishnamurthy discloses "the creation and transmission of the substreams are performed in a lock step manner" (Krishnamurthy: figures 1-3, column 4, lines 32-67 - column 5, lines 1-17, wherein the lock-step manner is the creation and synchronization).

Regarding claim 13, note the examiners rejection for claim 4, and in addition Li discloses "transmitting the plurality of new pictures to a plurality of nodes" (Li: figure 2, wherein the plurality of nodes are the plurality of clients) and "commanding the nodes to display the picture" (Li: figures 1-2, wherein the clients receive the data for subsequent display).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJC

Mehrdad Dastouri
MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600